IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GRACE M. DERR, et al.,

No. 4:19-CV-00215

Plaintiffs,

(Judge Brann)

v.

(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

NOVEMBER 20, 2019

Grace M. Derr, William J. Derr, and Stephen A. Derr filed this civil rights complaint alleging that several individuals and entities violated their rights.¹ On October 23, 2019, Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle issued two Reports and Recommendations recommending that this Court deem unopposed two motions to dismiss or, alternatively, dismiss the complaint with prejudice for failure to prosecute.² No timely objections were filed to these Reports and Recommendations.

-

Doc. 3.

² Docs. 31, 32.

Where no objection is made to a report and recommendation, this Court will review the recommendation only for clear error.³ Regardless of whether timely objections are made, district courts may accept, reject, or modify—in whole or in part—the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.⁴ Upon review of the record, the Court finds no clear error in Magistrate Judge Arbuckle's conclusion that the relevant factors set forth in *Poulis v. State Farm Fire & Cas. Co.*⁵ militate in favor of dismissing the complaint for failure to prosecute. Consequently,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- Magistrate Judge William I. Arbuckle's Reports and Recommendations
 (Docs. 31, 32) are ADOPTED;
- 2. Defendants' motions to dismiss (Docs. 21, 23) are **DENIED** as moot;
- 3. Plaintiffs' complaint (Doc. 3) is **DISMISSED** with prejudice; and
- 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

<u>s/Matthew W. Brann</u>Matthew W. BrannUnited States District Judge

2

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), advisory committee notes; *see Henderson v. Carlson*, 812 F.2d 874, 878 (3d Cir. 1987) (explaining that court should in some manner review recommendations regardless of whether objections were filed).

⁴ 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule 72.31.

⁵ 747 F.2d 863, 868 (3d Cir. 1984).